arXiv:1601.05137v3 [cs.IT] 15 May 2016

On Secure Network Coding for Two Unicast Sessions

Gaurav Kumar Agarwal, Martina Cardone, Christina Fragouli
Department of Electrical Engineering
University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA
Email: {gauravagarwal, martina.cardone, christina.fragouli}@ucla.edu

***Abstract*—This paper characterizes the secret message capacity of three networks where two unicast sessions share some of the communication resources. Each network consists of erasure channels with state feedback. A passive eavesdropper is assumed to wiretap any one of the links. The capacity achieving schemes as well as the outer bounds are formulated as linear programs. The proposed strategies are then numerically evaluated and shown to achieve higher rate performances (up to a double single- or sum-rate) with respect to alternative strategies, where the network resources are time-shared among the two sessions. These results represent a step towards the secure capacity characterization for general networks. They also show that, even in configurations for which network coding does not offer benefits in absence of security, it can become beneficial under security constraints.**

I. Introduction

Secure network coding has well established the benefits of network coding for secure multicast transmission. We are here interested in a different type of traffic where we have two independent unicast sessions and we seek to answer the following question: what are the benefits that 'network coding' type operations offer?

We consider the three networks in Fig. 1, namely the Y-network, the Reverse Y (RY)-network and the X-network. In the Y-network two sources (able to generate randomness at infinite rate) wish to communicate two independent messages to a common destination, via an intermediate node (unable to generate randomness). In the RY-network one source (able to generate randomness at finite rate) aims to communicate two independent messages to two different receivers, through an intermediate node (unable to generate randomness). Finally, in the X-network two sources (able to generate randomness at infinite rate) seek to communicate two independent messages to two different receivers, via two intermediate nodes (unable to generate randomness). In our network model, the transmissions take place over orthogonal erasure channels; although this being a simplistic assumption, yet it captures some intrinsic properties of the wireless medium (such as its lossy nature). A passive eavesdropper wiretaps any one of the communication links, but the information about which one is not available[1]. Public feedback, which in [1] was shown to increase the secrecy capacity, is used, i.e., each of the legitimate nodes involved in the communication sends an acknowledgment after each transmission; this is received by all nodes in the network as well as by the eavesdropper.

The work of the authors was partially funded by NSF under award 1321120. G. K. Agarwal is also supported by the Guru Krupa Fellowship.

[1]This assumption is equivalent to have one eavesdropper on every link, but these eavesdroppers do not cooperate among themselves.



Fig. 1: The Y-network in (a), the RY-network in (b) and the X-network in (c).

We characterize the secret message capacity for the three networks in Fig. 1. The capacity-achieving schemes involve two phases: the key-sharing phase and the message-transmission phase. In particular, first a secret key is created between two consecutive legitimate nodes (link-by-link key generation); then, these keys are used to encrypt and transmit the message like in the one-time pad [2]. For each of the analyzed networks, the capacity is given as the solution of a Linear Program (LP). We also show, through numerical simulations, the benefits of our schemes compared to two alternative strategies where (a) the two sessions are time-shared and (b) the shared link is time-shared among the two sessions. We prove that 'network coding' type operations are beneficial for the three networks in Fig. 1. This is because random packets transmitted by different sources can be mixed to create the key to be used on the shared link. Similarly, the same set of random packets can be used to generate secret keys for different destinations. This result is surprising since, in absence of security considerations, network coding is not beneficial for the networks in Fig. 1.

Related Work. The characterization of the secret capacity for wireless networks is a long-standing open problem. Relevant work includes [3], where the author derived the secret message capacity of the wiretap channel without feedback, and [4], where it was shown that secure network coding is optimal for wireless networks with error-free and unit capacity channels. The work presented in this paper follows a line of research which was pioneered by the authors in [5], where the secret capacity of the point-to-point channel was characterized and expressed as the solution of an LP. In particular, the capacity-

achieving scheme proposed by the authors consists of two phases, namely the key-sharing and the message-transmission phases. The same authors extended this approach to characterize the secret capacity of more complex networks, for example: (i) the parallel channel network where a source seeks to securely communicate a message to a destination through a number of independent parallel channels [6], and (ii) the V-network where two sources, which share a common randomness, aim to convey the same message to a common destination [6]. By using a similar approach, in [7] the authors derived the secret message capacity of the line network when the eavesdropper wiretaps one channel as well as all the channels. Recently, in [8] the authors considered a general network and designed two polynomial-time secure transmission schemes. Although the two schemes were not proven to be capacity-achieving, the work in [8] represents an attempt to characterize the secrecy capacity of an arbitrary network. Contrary to all these works, where a single unicast session was considered, here we study the case where two unicast sessions take place simultaneously and share part of the resources.

Paper Organization. Section II describes the three networks of interest, namely the Y-, the RY- and the X-network. Section III presents our main results, i.e., it characterizes the secret message capacity and it presents comparisons with alternative strategies. Finally, Section IV concludes the paper.

II. System Model and Main Results

Notation. With $[n_1 : n_2]$ we denote the set of integers from n_1 to $n_2 \geq n_1$. For an index set $\mathcal{A}$ we let $Y_{\mathcal{A}} = \{Y_j : j \in \mathcal{A}\}$; $\mathcal{A}\backslash\mathcal{B}$ is the set of elements that belong to $\mathcal{A}$ but not to $\mathcal{B}$. Y^i is a vector of length i with components $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_i)$.

We consider the three networks in Fig. 1, namely (i) the Y-network in Fig. 1(a) where two sources S_1 and S_2 aim to communicate two independent messages W_1 and W_2 to a common destination D; (ii) the RY-network in Fig. 1(b) where one source S has a message W_1 for destination D_1 and a message W_2 for destination D_2; both in the Y- and in the RY-network the communication occurs through an intermediate/relay node M; finally, we study (iii) the X-network in Fig. 1(c) where two sources S_1 and S_2 seek to communicate two independent messages W_1 and W_2 to two different destinations D_1 and D_2 via two intermediate nodes M_1 and M_2.

Each communication link is an independent erasure channel with one legitimate receiver and one possible passive eavesdropper. In each network, the eavesdropper wiretaps one channel, which one exactly is not known. The erasure probabilities are denoted as δ_j and $\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}$, with $j \in [1:3]$ for the Y- and the RY-network and $j \in [1:5]$ for the X-network[2].

The j-th channel input at time instant i, with $i \in [1:n]$ (where n is the total number of transmissions), is denoted as $X_{ji} \in \mathbb{F}_q^L$ and referred to as a packet. Without loss of generality, in what follows we let $L\log(q) = 1$, i.e., we express the rate in terms of packets. Similarly, Y_{ji} and Z_{ji} denote the outputs at the legitimate receiver and at the passive eavesdropper, respectively, on channel j at time i.

For the three scenarios in Fig. 1 we assume public state feedback, i.e., each legitimate node sends an acknowledgment whether the packet transmission was successful, which is received by all other nodes as well as by the eavesdropper. We denote with F_{ji} the feedback of the transmission on channel j at time i. For the X-network in Fig. 1(c) we have[3]

$$\Pr\left\{Y_{[1:5]i}, Z_{[1:5]i} \,|X_{[1:5]i}\right\} = \prod_{j=1}^{5} \Pr\left\{Y_{ji}\,|X_{ji}\right\} \Pr\left\{Z_{ji}\,|X_{ji}\right\},$$

$$\Pr\left\{Y_{ji}\,|X_{ji}\right\} = \begin{cases} 1-\delta_j, & Y_{ji} = X_{ji} \\ \delta_j, & Y_{ji} = \perp \end{cases},$$

$$\Pr\left\{Z_{ji}\,|X_{ji}\right\} = \begin{cases} 1-\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}, & Z_{ji} = X_{ji} \\ \delta_{j\mathrm{E}}, & Z_{ji} = \perp \end{cases},$$

where with $\perp$ we denote the symbol of erasure.

We assume that the intermediate nodes are unable to generate private randomness[4]. For the Y- and the X-network the sources S_1 and S_2 can generate private randomness Θ_1 and Θ_2 at infinite rate. Differently, for the RY-network the source S can generate private randomness at a finite rate D_0. The messages W_1 and W_2 consist of N_1 and N_2 packets, respectively, and have to be reliably and securely decoded at the legitimate receiver.

Definition 1. *For the X-network in Fig. 1(c) a secure coding scheme with parameters (N_1, N_2, n, ϵ) consists of 5 encoding functions $f_{ji},\ j \in [1:5]$ for each $i \in [1:n]$ such that*

$$X_{ji} = \begin{cases} f_{ji}\left(W_j, \Theta_j, F_{\mathcal{A}}^{i-1}\right) & \text{if } j \in [1:2] \\ f_{ji}\left(Y_1^{i-1}, Y_2^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^{i-1}\right) & \text{if } j = 3 \\ f_{ji}\left(Y_3^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^{i-1}\right) & \text{if } j \in [4:5] \end{cases},$$

where $\mathcal{A} = [1:5]$, and of 2 decoding functions ϕ_j such that D_j, $j \in [1:2]$, can decode the message W_j with high probability, i.e., $\Pr\left\{\phi_j\left(Y_{j+3}^n\right) \neq W_j\right\} < \epsilon$. Moreover, the messages W_1 and W_2 have to remain secret from the eavesdropper, i.e., $I\left(W_1, W_2; Z_k^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) < \epsilon,\ \forall k \in [1:5]$. A non-negative rate pair (R_1, R_2) is securely achievable if, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a secure coding scheme with parameters (N_1, N_2, n, ϵ) such that $R_j < \frac{1}{n}N_j - \epsilon,\ \forall j \in [1:2]$.

The main contribution of this paper is the characterization of the secret message capacity region (the largest securely achievable rate pair (R_1, R_2)) for the three networks in Fig. 1 as described in the next three theorems.

Theorem 1. *The secret message capacity region of the Y-network in Fig. 1(a) with unlimited private randomness at the sources S_1 and S_2 and no private randomness at the relay*

[2]Index j enumerates the channel, e.g., for the RY-network in Fig. 1(b) the channels from S to M, from M to D_1 and from M to D_2 are referred to as channels 3, 1 and 2, respectively.

[3]Although definitions are given only for the X-network, they straightforwardly extend to the Y- and the RY-network.

[4] The results here presented readily extend to the case when intermediate nodes can generate private randomness at finite rate. If intermediate nodes can generate randomness at infinite rate a naive link-by-link time sharing strategy would be capacity-achieving.

node M*, is the feasible region of the following LP,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & g(R_1,R_2)\\
\text{s.t.} \quad & k_j \geq R_j \tfrac{1-\delta_{jE}}{1-\delta_j\delta_{jE}},\ j\in[1:2]\\
& k_3 \geq (R_1+R_2)\tfrac{1-\delta_{3E}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3E}}\\
& \tfrac{R_j}{1-\delta_j}+\tfrac{k_j}{(1-\delta_j)\delta_{jE}}\leq 1,\ j\in[1:2]\\
& \tfrac{R_1+R_2}{1-\delta_3}+\tfrac{k_3}{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3E}}\leq 1\\
& k_3 \leq \left(\tfrac{k_1}{\delta_{1E}}+\tfrac{k_2}{\delta_{2E}}\right)\tfrac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3E}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3E}}\\
& R_i,k_j\geq 0,\ i\in[1:2],\ j\in[1:3],
\end{aligned}$$

where $g(R_1,R_2)$ *can be any linear function of* (R_1,R_2).

Theorem 2. *The secret message capacity region of the RY-network in Fig. 1(b) with limited private randomness of rate* D_0 *at the source* S *and no private randomness at the relay node* M*, is the feasible region of the following LP,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & g(R_1,R_2)\\
\text{s.t.} \quad & k_3+e\tfrac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3E}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3E}} \geq (R_1+R_2)\tfrac{1-\delta_{3E}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3E}}\\
& k_j \geq R_j \tfrac{1-\delta_{jE}}{1-\delta_j\delta_{jE}},\ j\in[1:2]\\
& \tfrac{R_1+R_2}{1-\delta_3}+\tfrac{k_3}{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3E}}+\tfrac{e}{1-\delta_3}\leq 1\\
& \tfrac{R_j}{1-\delta_j}+\tfrac{k_j}{(1-\delta_j)\delta_{jE}}\leq 1,\ j\in[1:2]\\
& k_3 \leq (D_0-e)\tfrac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3E}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3E}}\\
& k_j \leq (e+\tfrac{k_3}{\delta_{3E}})\tfrac{(1-\delta_j)\delta_{jE}}{1-\delta_j\delta_{jE}},\ j\in[1:2]\\
& R_i,e,k_j\geq 0,\ i\in[1:2],\ j\in[1:3],
\end{aligned}$$

where $g(R_1,R_2)$ *can be any linear function of* (R_1,R_2).

Theorem 3. *The secret message capacity region of the X-network in Fig. 1(c) with unlimited private randomness at the sources* S_1 *and* S_2 *and no private randomness at the relay nodes* M_1 *and* M_2*, is the feasible region of the following LP,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & g(R_1,R_2)\\
\text{s.t.} \quad & k_j \geq R_j \tfrac{1-\delta_{jE}}{1-\delta_j\delta_{jE}},\ j\in[1:2]\\
& k_3+e\tfrac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3E}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3E}} \geq (R_1+R_2)\tfrac{1-\delta_{3E}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3E}}\\
& k_j \geq R_{j-3}\tfrac{1-\delta_{jE}}{1-\delta_j\delta_{jE}},\ j\in[4:5]\\
& \tfrac{R_j}{1-\delta_j}+\tfrac{k_j}{(1-\delta_j)\delta_{jE}}\leq 1,\ j\in[1:2]\\
& \tfrac{R_{j-3}}{1-\delta_j}+\tfrac{k_j}{(1-\delta_j)\delta_{jE}}\leq 1,\ j\in[4:5]\\
& \tfrac{R_1+R_2}{1-\delta_3}+\tfrac{k_3}{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3E}}+\tfrac{e}{1-\delta_3}\leq 1\\
& k_3 \leq (\tfrac{k_1}{\delta_{1E}}+\tfrac{k_2}{\delta_{2E}}-e)\tfrac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3E}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3E}}\\
& k_j \leq (e+\tfrac{k_3}{\delta_{3E}})\tfrac{(1-\delta_j)\delta_{jE}}{1-\delta_j\delta_{jE}},\ j\in[4:5]\\
& R_i,e,k_j\geq 0,\ i\in[1:2],\ j\in[1:5],
\end{aligned}$$

where $g(R_1,R_2)$ *can be any linear function of* (R_1,R_2).

III. Secure Capacity Characterization

We here describe the secure coding schemes[5] and the outer bounds and formulate them as LPs. We then show through numerical evaluations the benefits (in terms of achievable secure rate) of our scheme with respect to two naive strategies: (i) *path sharing*, i.e., the whole communication resources are time-shared among the two sessions and (ii) *link sharing*, i.e., the shared link is time-shared among the two sessions.

A. Achievability

Our secure coding schemes for the networks in Fig. 1 consist of two phases, namely the key-sharing and the message-transmission. In what follows we describe these two phases and explain how these relate to the LPs in Theorems 1-3.

1) The Y-network: On channel $j\in[1:2]$, source S_j sends $\frac{k_j}{(1-\delta_j)\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}}$ independent random packets generated from her private randomness (assumed to be infinite). Out of these, a total of k_j packets are received by the relay node M, but not by the possible eavesdropper. We do not know exactly which packets, out of the $\frac{k_j}{\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}}$ ones received by M, are also received by the possible eavesdropper. However, out of the packets received by M, we can always create k_j independent packets, which are also independent of the packets received by the possible eavesdropper. We do this by multiplying the $\frac{k_j}{\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}}$ packets of M by an MDS code matrix of dimension $\left[\frac{k_j}{\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}}\right]\times[k_j]$. Thus, without loss of generality, we can assume that we always know which packets are received by the legitimate node and not by the possible eavesdropper, if we know their amount [7]. All these packets are used to generate a *secret key* on channel $j\in[1:2]$ between nodes S_j and M (*key-sharing* phase). These packets are then expanded by means of an MDS code matrix of size $[k_j]\times[R_j]$ and used as in the one-time pad [2] to encrypt R_j message packets, which are sent using the ARQ protocol (*message-transmission* phase).

At the intermediate node M (assumed to be unable to generate any randomness) there are $\left(\frac{k_1}{\delta_{1\mathrm{E}}}\right)+\left(\frac{k_2}{\delta_{2\mathrm{E}}}\right)$ available random packets (received from S_1 and S_2 on channels 1 and 2, respectively). By means of an MDS code these random packets are first expanded by a factor $\frac{1}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}$ and then only $\frac{k_3}{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}$ of them are sent to node D. With this, the number of random packets received by D, but not by the possible eavesdropper is k_3. These random packets are used to generate a *secret key* on channel 3 between nodes M and D (*key-sharing* phase). Similar to channels 1 and 2, also for channel 3 we expand these k_3 packets by means of an MDS code matrix of dimension $[k_3]\times[R_1+R_2]$ and then we use them to encrypt R_1+R_2 message packets as in the one-time pad [2]. These message packets are finally transmitted by using the ARQ protocol (*message-transmission* phase).

The scheme described above is equivalent to the LP in Theorem 1, where the variables R_i and k_j , with $i\in[1:2]$ and $j\in[1:3]$, represent the message rate for the pair $\mathsf{S}_i-\mathsf{D}$ and the key created on channel j, respectively. In particular: (i) the *first* and *second* inequalities are security constraints, i.e., they ensure that the key that is generated is greater than the key which is consumed[6]; (ii) the *third* and *fourth* inequalities are time constraints, i.e., the length of the key generation phase

[5] Schemes consider the expected number of transmissions needed. Similar to [5], it can be shown that the number of transmissions needed concentrates exponentially fast around the average enabling to achieve expected rate values.

[6] Since the encrypted packets are sent by using the ARQ protocol, the key consumed on channel $j\in[1:3]$ (i.e., the number of packets received by the possible eavesdropper on that channel) is $R_j\frac{1-\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_j\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}}$, with $R_3=R_1+R_2$.

plus the length of the message sending phase cannot exceed the total available time; (iii) the *fifth* inequality follows since node M has zero randomness and so the key that it can create is constrained by the randomness received from S_1 and S_2.

2) The RY-network: In [7], the authors showed that, in a line network where a node has limited randomness and the next node can generate randomness based on the one received from the previous node(s), a combination of ARQ and MDS coding is needed for optimally generating the key. Following this, on channel 3 of the RY-network, the source S transmits e independent random packets using the ARQ protocol. These packets are all received by the relay node M, while the possible eavesdropper receives a fraction $\frac{1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}$ of them. By means of an MDS code, the remaining (D_0-e) random packets at the source S are expanded by a factor $\frac{1}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}$ and then only $\frac{k_3}{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}$ of them are sent to node M. Thus, the total number of packets received by the intermediate node M, but not by the possible eavesdropper is $k_3+e\frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}$. Similar to the Y-network, from the $e+\frac{k_3}{\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}$ independent random packets received by M, we generate $k_3+e\frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}$ packets. All these packets are used to generate a *secret key* on channel 3 between nodes S and M (*key-sharing* phase). They are then expanded by means of an MDS code matrix of size $\left[k_3+e\frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}\right]\times[R_1+R_2]$ and used as in the one-time pad [2] to encrypt R_1+R_2 message packets, which are sent using the ARQ protocol (*message-transmission* phase).

At the relay node M (assumed unable to generate any randomness) there are $\left(\frac{k_3}{\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}+e\right)$ available random packets (received from S on channel 3). By means of an MDS code these random packets $\forall j\in[1:2]$ are first expanded by a factor $\frac{1}{1-\delta_j\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}}$ and then only $\frac{k_j}{(1-\delta_j)\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}}$ of them are sent to node D_j on channel j. With this, the number of random packets received by D_j, but not by the possible eavesdropper is k_j. These packets are used to generate a *secret key* on channel j between nodes M and D_j (*key-sharing* phase). These k_j packets are then expanded by means of an MDS code matrix of dimension $[k_j]\times[R_j]$ and used to encrypt R_j message packets as in the one-time pad [2]. These message packets are finally transmitted using ARQ (*message-transmission* phase).

Similar to the Y-network, also for the RY-network the secure transmission strategy above is equivalent to the LP in Theorem 2. The variables R_i, k_j and e, with $i\in[1:2]$ and $j\in[1:3]$, represent the message rate for the pair $\mathsf{S}-\mathsf{D}_i$, the key created on channel j, and the extra randomness (in addition to the one sent for generating the key k_3) sent from the source S, respectively. In particular: (i) the *first* and *second* inequalities are security constraints; (ii) the *third* and the *fourth* inequalities are time constraints; (iii) the *fifth* (respectively, *sixth*) inequality is due to the fact that the key that node S (respectively, M) can create is constrained by its limited randomness (respectively, the randomness that it gets from S).

3) The X-network: The secure transmission strategy here proposed for the X-network in Fig. 1(c) consists of a mix of the two schemes designed for the Y- and the RY-network. In particular, on channels 1 and 2 we use exactly the same operations used on channels 1 and 2 of the Y-network, while on channels 3-5 the same strategy proposed for the RY-network applies, with the small difference that the available finite randomness at node S of the RY-network (node M_1 in the X-network) is now replaced by $D_0=\left(\frac{k_1}{\delta_{1\mathrm{E}}}\right)+\left(\frac{k_2}{\delta_{2\mathrm{E}}}\right)$.

B. Converse

We here highlight the main steps to derive an outer bound on the secure capacity for the networks in Fig. 1 and to formulate it as an LP; the complete proof can be found in the Appendix.
Step 1. We prove and make use of the following lemma (see Appendix A for the details), which is a generalization of those in [7] for the line network.

Lemma 4. *For any $j\in\mathcal{A}$, we have*

$$(1-\delta_j)\,\delta_{jE}\sum_{i=1}^{n}H\left(X_{ji}\mid Y_j^{i-1},Z_j^{i-1},F_j^{i-1},W_{\mathcal{B}},F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right)-$$
$$(1-\delta_{jE})\sum_{i=1}^{n}I\left(Y_j^{i-1},F_j^{i-1};X_{ji}\mid Z_j^{i-1},F_j^{i-1},W_{\mathcal{B}},F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right)$$
$$=H\left(Y_j^n\mid W_{\mathcal{B}},F_{\mathcal{A}}^n,Z_j^n\right), \tag{1a}$$
$$(1-\delta_j)\sum_{i=1}^{n}H\left(X_{ji}\mid Y_j^{i-1},F_j^{i-1},W_{\mathcal{B}},F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right)$$
$$=H\left(Y_j^n\mid W_{\mathcal{B}},F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right), \tag{1b}$$
$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}I\left(W_{\mathcal{B}};X_{ji}\mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n,Z_j^{i-1},F_j^{i-1}\right)<\frac{\epsilon}{1-\delta_{jE}}, \tag{1c}$$
$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}I\left(W_{\mathcal{B}};X_{ji}\mid Y_j^{i-1},Z_j^{i-1},F_j^{i-1},F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right)\geq\frac{nR_j}{1-\delta_{jE}\delta_j}, \tag{1d}$$

where: (i) for the Y-network $\mathcal{A}=[1:3]$, $\mathcal{B}=\{j\}$, $W_3=W_{[1:2]}$ and $R_3=R_1+R_2$; (ii) for the RY-network $\mathcal{A}=[1:3]$, $\mathcal{B}=[1:2]$ and $R_3=R_1+R_2$; (iii) for the X-network $\mathcal{A}=[1:5]$, $\mathcal{B}=\{j\}$, $W_3=W_4=W_5=W_{[1:2]}$, $R_3=R_1+R_2$, $R_4=R_1$ and $R_5=R_2$. Moreover, for node D in the Y-network we have

$$nR_3\leq(1-\delta_3)\sum_{i=1}^{n}I\left(W_1,W_2;X_{3i}\mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n,Y_3^{i-1},F_3^{i-1}\right), \tag{1e}$$

for node D_j, $j\in[1:2]$ in the RY-network, we have

$$nR_j\leq(1-\delta_j)\sum_{i=1}^{n}I\left(W_j;X_{ji}\mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n,Y_j^{i-1},F_j^{i-1}\right), \tag{1f}$$

and for node D_j, $j\in[1:2]$ in the X-network, we have

$$nR_j\leq(1-\delta_{j+3})\sum_{i=1}^{n}I\left(W_j;X_{j+3i}\mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j+3}^n,Y_{j+3}^{i-1},F_{j+3}^{i-1}\right). \tag{1g}$$

Step 2. We use the correspondences between the terms in (2) at the top of the next page with: (i) $\mathcal{A}=[1:3]$, $\kappa=3$, $\lambda\in[1:2]$ and $W_3=W_{[1:2]}$ for the Y-network; (ii) $\mathcal{A}=[1:3]$, $j=3$, $\kappa\in[1:2]$, $\mathcal{B}=[1:2]$, $W_3=W_{[1:2]}$ and $e_3=e$ for the RY-network; (iii) $\mathcal{A}=[1:5]$, $j=3$, $\lambda\in[1:2]$, $\kappa\in[4:5]$, $\mathcal{B}=\{j\}$, $W_3=W_4=W_5=W_{[1:2]}$ and $e_3=e$ for the X-network. All the

$$nk_j \leftrightarrow \frac{\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}(1-\delta_j)}{\delta_j(1-\delta_{j\mathrm{E}})}\left((1-\delta_j\delta_{j\mathrm{E}})\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, W_{\mathcal{B}}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right) - H\left(Y_j^n | W_{\mathcal{B}}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\right), \tag{2a}$$

$$ne_j \leftrightarrow \frac{1-\delta_j\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}}{\delta_j(1-\delta_{j\mathrm{E}})}\left(H\left(Y_j^n | W_{\mathcal{B}}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) - (1-\delta_j)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n, F_j^{i-1}, W_{\mathcal{B}}\right)\right), \tag{2b}$$

$$nk_\kappa \leftrightarrow \delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}(1-\delta_\kappa)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} \mid Y_\kappa^{i-1}, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, W_1, W_2, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n\right), \tag{2c}$$

$$nk_\lambda \leftrightarrow \delta_{\lambda\mathrm{E}}(1-\delta_\lambda)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda i} \mid Y_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n\right). \tag{2d}$$



(a) Y-network: $(\delta_1, \delta_{1\mathrm{E}}) = (0.2, 0.05)$, $(\delta_2, \delta_{2\mathrm{E}}) = (0.3, 0.05)$, $(\delta_3, \delta_{3\mathrm{E}}) = (0.25, 0.05)$.

(b) RY-network: $(\delta_1, \delta_{1\mathrm{E}}) = (0.1, 0.1)$, $(\delta_2, \delta_{2\mathrm{E}}) = (0.2, 0.05)$, $(\delta_3, \delta_{3\mathrm{E}}) = (0.3, 0.15)$, $D_0 = 0.4$.

(c) X-network: $(\delta_1, \delta_{1\mathrm{E}}) = (0.1, 0.1)$, $(\delta_2, \delta_{2\mathrm{E}}) = (0.2, 0.05)$, $(\delta_3, \delta_{3\mathrm{E}}) = (0.3, 0.15)$, $(\delta_4, \delta_{4\mathrm{E}}) = (0.4, 0.35)$, $(\delta_5, \delta_{5\mathrm{E}}) = (0.5, 0.2)$.

Fig. 2: Numerical evaluations for the three networks in Fig. 1.

quantities in (2) are non-negative (see Appendix B-D for the details).

Step 3. By using the correspondences in (2), Lemma 4 and information theoretic properties we derive an outer bound on the secure capacity (see Appendices B-D for the details). Each constraint in the LPs in Theorems 1-3 is proved to match an outer bound.

C. Numerical Evaluations

We here compare the secrecy capacity performance of our schemes in Theorems 1-3 with respect to two naive strategies, i.e., the *path sharing* and the *link sharing*. In the *path sharing* the whole communication resources, at each time instant, are used only by one session; for example, for the X-network we have a time-sharing between S_1-M_1-M_2-D_1 and S_2-M_1-M_2-D_2. Differently, in the *link sharing* strategy only the shared communication link is time-shared among the two unicast sessions; for example, in the X-network only the M_1-M_2 link is time-shared. For both these strategies we do not allow the source node that does not participate to act as a source of randomness, e.g., for the X-network the random packets sent by S_1 cannot be used to encrypt the message packets of S_2. Fig. 2 shows the performance (in terms of secrecy capacity region) of these two time-sharing strategies and of our schemes in Theorems 1-3. From Fig. 2 we observe that our schemes in Theorems 1-3 (solid line) achieve higher rates compared to the two time-sharing strategies. Large rate gains are attained when, for each channel, the eavesdropper receives almost everything and the legitimate node receives almost no information. Under these channel conditions, for the Y-network the individual rates are double than those achieved by the link-sharing strategy; for the RY- and X-network the sum-rate is twice than that of the link-sharing scheme. In general, these gains follow since: (i) in the Y-network S_1 and S_2 transmit random packets to M and these can be mixed to create a key on the shared link; (ii) in the RY-network the same set of random packets can be used to generate keys for both the M-D_1 and M-D_2 links. These factors decrease the number of random packets required to be sent from the source(s) and implies that more message packets can be carried. Finally, (iii) in the X-network we have the benefits of both the Y- and RY-network.

IV. Conclusions

We characterized the secret capacity for networks where two unicast sessions share one communication link. This was attained by designing schemes and by deriving outer bounds which were formulated as LPs. Through numerical evaluations we showed that our transmission strategies achieve higher rates compared to schemes where the communication resources are time-shared among the two sessions. These results show that, even in network configurations for which network coding does not offer benefits in absence of security, it can become beneficial under security constraints.

Appendix A
Proof of Lemma 4

We here prove the result in Lemma 4. We start by analyzing the Y-network. We have, $\forall j \in \mathcal{A} = [1:3]$ and with $W_3 =$

$W_{[1:2]}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&H\left(Y_j^n|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n,Z_j^n\right)\\
&=H\left(Y_j^n,F_j^n|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n,Z_j^n\right)\\
&\overset{(a)}{=}H\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n,Z_j^n\right)\\
&+H\left(Y_{jn},F_{jn}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n,Z_j^n,Y_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&\overset{(b)}{=}H\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,Z_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&-I\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1};Z_{jn},F_{jn}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,Z_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&+H\left(Y_{jn}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n,Z_j^n,Y_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&\overset{(c)}{=}H\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,Z_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&-I\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1};Z_{jn}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,Z_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1},F_{jn}\right)\\
&+H\left(Y_{jn}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n,Z_j^n,Y_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&=H\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,Z_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&-(1-\delta_{jE})\,I\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1};X_{jn}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,Z_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&+(1-\delta_j)\,\delta_{jE}H\left(X_{jn}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,F_j^{n-1},Z_j^{n-1},Y_j^{n-1}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the equality in (a) follows from the chain rule of the entropy; (ii) the equality in (b) is due to the definition of mutual information; (iii) finally, the equality in (c) is because F_{jn} is independent of the rest of the random variables. By recursively proceeding in the same way for $H\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,Z_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}\right)$, we get the result in (1a). We now prove (1b) which is similar to (1a).

We have, $\forall j\in\mathcal{A}=[1:3]$ and with $W_3=W_{[1:2]}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&H\left(Y_j^n|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\\
&=H\left(Y_j^n,F_j^n|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\\
&\overset{(a)}{=}H\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\\
&+H\left(Y_{jn},F_{jn}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n,Y_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&\overset{(b)}{=}H\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,F_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&-I\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1};F_{jn}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,F_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&+H\left(Y_{jn}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n,Y_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&\overset{(c)}{=}H\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,F_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&+H\left(Y_{jn}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n,Y_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&=H\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,F_j^{n-1}\right)\\
&+(1-\delta_j)\,H\left(X_{jn}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,F_j^{n-1},Y_j^{n-1}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the equality in (a) follows from the chain rule of the entropy; (ii) the equality in (b) is due to the definition of mutual information; (iii) finally, the equality in (c) is because F_{jn} is independent of the rest of the random variables. By recursively proceeding in the same way for $H\left(Y_j^{n-1},F_j^{n-1}|W_j,F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,F_j^{n-1}\right)$, we get the result in (1b).

By means of similar steps, it is not difficult to prove the result in (1a) and (1b) for the RY- and X-network.

We have, $\forall j\in\mathcal{A}=[1:3]$ and with $W_3=W_{[1:2]}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\epsilon&\overset{(a)}{>}I\left(W_j;Z_j^n,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\\
&\overset{(b)}{=}I\left(W_j;Z_j^n,F_j^n|F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n\right)\\
&\overset{(c)}{=}\sum_{i=1}^n I\left(W_j;Z_{ji},F_{ji}|F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,F_j^{i-1},Z_j^{i-1}\right)\\
&\overset{(d)}{=}\sum_{i=1}^n I\left(W_j;Z_{ji}|F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,F_j^{i-1},F_{ji},Z_j^{i-1}\right)\\
&=\sum_{i=1}^n(1-\delta_{jE})\,I\left(W_j;X_{ji}|F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,F_j^{i-1},Z_j^{i-1}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) is due to the security constraints; (ii) the equality in (b) follows from the independence of W_j on $F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n$; (iii) the equality in (c) is due to the chain rule of the mutual information; (iv) finally, the equality in (d) is due to the independence of W_j on F_{ji}. This proves (1c) for the Y-network. By means of similar steps, it is not difficult to prove the result in (1c) for the RY- and X-network.

We then have, $\forall j\in\mathcal{A}=[1:3]$, with $W_3=W_{[1:2]}$ and $R_3=R_1+R_2$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
nR_j&\overset{(a)}{\leq}I\left(W_j;Y_3^n,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)+n\epsilon\\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq}I\left(W_j;Y_j^n,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)+n\epsilon\\
&\overset{(c)}{=}I\left(W_j;Y_j^n,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n,Z_j^n\right)-I\left(W_j;Z_j^n|Y_j^n,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)+n\epsilon\\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq}I\left(W_j;Y_j^n,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n,Z_j^n\right)+n\epsilon\\
&\overset{(e)}{=}I\left(W_j;Y_j^n,F_j^n,Z_j^n|F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n\right)+n\epsilon\\
&\overset{(f)}{=}\sum_{i=1}^n I\left(W_j;Y_{ji},F_{ji},Z_{ji}|Y_j^{i-1},F_j^{i-1},Z_j^{i-1},F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n\right)+n\epsilon\\
&\overset{(g)}{=}\sum_{i=1}^n I\left(W_j;Y_{ji},Z_{ji}|Y_j^{i-1},F_j^{i-1},Z_j^{i-1},F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n,F_{ji}\right)+n\epsilon\\
&=(1-\delta_{jE}\delta_j)\sum_{i=1}^n I\left(W_j;X_{ji}|Y_j^{i-1},F_j^{i-1},Z_j^{i-1},F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n\right)+n\epsilon,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) is due to the Fano's inequality; (ii) the inequality in (b) follows from the Markov chain $W_j-Y_j^n,F_{\mathcal{A}}^n-Y_3^n$ for $j\in[1:2]$; (iii) the equality in (c) is due to the chain rule of the mutual information; (iv) the inequality in (d) is because the mutual information is a non-negative quantity; (v) the equality in (e) follows from the independence of W_j and $F_{\mathcal{A}\backslash j}^n$; (vi) the equality in (f) is due to the chain rule of the mutual information; (vii) finally, the equality in (g) follows from the independence of W_j on F_{ji}. This proves (1d) for the Y-network. By means of similar steps, it is not difficult to prove the result in (1d) for the RY- and X-network.

Finally, for node D in the Y-network we have

$$n(R_1+R_2)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} I\left(W_1, W_2; Y_3^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} I\left(W_1, W_2; Y_3^n, F_3^n | F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(W_1, W_2; Y_{3i}, F_{3i} | Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(d)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(W_1, W_2; Y_{3i} | Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, F_{3i}\right) + n\epsilon \\
&= (1-\delta_3) \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(W_1, W_2; X_{3i} | Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right) + n\epsilon,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) is due to the Fano's inequality; (ii) the equality in (b) follows from the independence of the pair (W_1, W_2) on $F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n$; (iii) the equality in (c) is due to the chain rule of the mutual information; (iv) finally, the equality in (d) follows from the independence of the pair (W_1, W_2) on F_{3i}. This proves (1e) for the Y-network. By means of similar steps, it is not difficult to prove the results in (1f) and in (1g) for the RY- and X-network, respectively.

Appendix B
Proof of the converse of Theorem 1

For the Y-network, in (2) we set $\mathcal{A} = [1:3]$, $\kappa = 3$ and $\lambda \in [1:2]$. We use (2c) and (2d) for proving the converse of Theorem 1. The RHS of these two expressions is positive as the entropy of a discrete random variable is positive.

First constraint. From (2d) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&nk_\lambda \\
&= \delta_{\lambda \mathrm{E}} (1-\delta_\lambda) \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda i} \mid Y_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n\right) \\
&\geq \delta_{\lambda \mathrm{E}} (1-\delta_\lambda) \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda i} \mid Y_\lambda^{i-1}, Z_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(a)}{\geq} \delta_{\lambda \mathrm{E}} (1-\delta_\lambda) \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda i} \mid Y_\lambda^{i-1}, Z_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n\right) \\
&\quad - H\left(Y_\lambda^n \mid W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n, Z_\lambda^n\right) \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} (1-\delta_{\lambda \mathrm{E}}) \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(Y_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}; X_{\lambda i} \mid Z_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} (1-\delta_{\lambda \mathrm{E}}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda i} \mid Z_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n\right)\right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda i} \mid Z_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n, Y_\lambda^{i-1}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(d)}{=} (1-\delta_{\lambda \mathrm{E}}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda i} \mid Z_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n\right)\right. \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{\lambda i}; W_\lambda | Z_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n\right) \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda i} \mid Z_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n, Y_\lambda^{i-1}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(e)}{\geq} (1-\delta_{\lambda \mathrm{E}}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda i} \mid Y_\lambda^{i-1}, Z_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n\right)\right. \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{\lambda i}; W_\lambda | Z_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n\right) \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda i} \mid Z_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n, Y_\lambda^{i-1}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(f)}{=} (1-\delta_{\lambda \mathrm{E}}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{\lambda i}; W_\lambda \mid Y_\lambda^{i-1}, Z_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n\right)\right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{\lambda i}; W_\lambda | Z_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(g)}{\geq} nR_\lambda \frac{1-\delta_{\lambda \mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_{\lambda \mathrm{E}}\delta_\lambda} - \epsilon,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is positive; (ii) the equality in (b) is due to (1a) in Lemma 4; (iii) the equality in (c) is due to the definition of mutual information; (iv) the equality in (d) follows from the definition of mutual information; (v) the inequality in (e) follows from the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (vi) the equality in (f) is due to the definition of mutual information; (vii) finally, the inequality in (g) follows by means of (1c) and (1d) in Lemma 4.

Second constraint. From (2c) with $W_{[1:2]} = W_3$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&nk_3 \\
&= \delta_{3\mathrm{E}} (1-\delta_3) \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_3, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(a)}{\geq} \delta_{3\mathrm{E}} (1-\delta_3) \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_3, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right) \\
&\quad - H\left(Y_3^n \mid W_3, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n, Z_3^n\right) \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} (1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}) \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}; X_{3i} \mid Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_3, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} (1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_3, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right)\right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_3, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(d)}{=} (1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right)\right. \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{3i}; W_3 | Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right) \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_3, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(e)}{\geq} (1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right)\right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{3i}; W_3 | Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right)\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&- \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_3, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}\right)\Bigg] \\
&\overset{(f)}{=} (1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}})\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{3i}; W_3 \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right)\right. \\
&\left.- \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{3i}; W_3 | Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(g)}{\geq} n(R_1+R_2)\frac{1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}\delta_3} - \epsilon,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is positive; (ii) the equality in (b) is due to (1a) in Lemma 4; (iii) the equality in (c) is due to the definition of mutual information; (iv) the equality in (d) follows from the definition of mutual information; (v) the inequality in (e) follows from the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (vi) the equality in (f) is due to the definition of mutual information; (vii) finally, the inequality in (g) follows by means of (1c) and (1d) in Lemma 4 with $R_3 = R_1 + R_2$.

Third constraint. From (2d) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{nk_\lambda}{\delta_{\lambda\mathrm{E}}} &= (1-\delta_\lambda)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda i} \mid Y_\lambda^{i-1}, F_\lambda^{i-1}, W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda}^n\right) \\
&= H\left(Y_\lambda^n \mid W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last equality follows from (1b) in Lemma 4.

Using this and Fano's inequality with $\lambda \in [1:2]$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
nR_\lambda + \frac{nk_\lambda}{\delta_{\lambda\mathrm{E}}} &\leq I\left(W_\lambda; Y_3^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_\lambda^n | W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} I\left(W_\lambda; Y_\lambda^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_\lambda^n | W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} I\left(W_\lambda; Y_\lambda^n \mid F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_\lambda^n | W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} H\left(Y_\lambda^n \mid F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} n\left(1-\delta_\lambda\right) + n\epsilon,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows because of the Markov chain $W_\lambda - Y_\lambda^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n - Y_3^n$, $\forall \lambda \in [1:2]$; (ii) the equality in (b) follows because of the independence between $F_{\mathcal{A}}^n$ and W_λ; (iii) the equality in (c) follows from the definition of mutual information; (iv) finally, the inequality in (d) follows since node M receives at most $n(1-\delta_\lambda)$ packets on channel $\lambda \in [1:2]$.

Fourth constraint. From (1e) in Lemma 4 we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&n\left(R_1+R_2\right) \\
&\leq (1-\delta_3)\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(W_{[1:2]}; X_{3i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}\right) \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} (1-\delta_3)\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}\right)\right. \\
&\left.- \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} (1-\delta_3)\, n \\
&- (1-\delta_3)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}\right) \\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} (1-\delta_3)\, n \\
&- (1-\delta_3)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, Z_3^{i-1}\right) \\
&\overset{(d)}{=} (1-\delta_3)\, n - \frac{k_3}{\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} n,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the equality in (a) follows from the definition of mutual information; (ii) the inequality in (b) is due to the fact that $H\left(X_{3i}\right) \leq 1$; (iii) the inequality in (c) is due to the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (iv) finally, the equality in (d) follows from (2c).

Fifth constraint. From (1b) and (2d) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&n\left(\frac{k_1}{\delta_{1\mathrm{E}}} + \frac{k_2}{\delta_{2\mathrm{E}}}\right)\frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} \\
&= \left[H\left(Y_1^n | W_1, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_2^n | W_2, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\right]\frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} \\
&\overset{(a)}{\geq} \left[H\left(Y_1^n | W_{[1,2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_2^n | W_{[1,2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\right]\frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} \\
&\overset{(b)}{\geq} H\left(Y_1^n, Y_2^n | W_{[1,2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} \\
&\overset{(c)}{\geq} I\left(Y_1^n, Y_2^n; Y_3^n, Z_3^n | W_{[1,2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} \\
&\overset{(d)}{=} \frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}\cdot \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(Y_1^n, Y_2^n; Y_{3i}, Z_{3i} \mid W_{[1,2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}\right) \\
&= (1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}\cdot \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(Y_1^n, Y_2^n; X_{3i} \mid W_{[1,2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_{3i}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(e)}{=} (1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}\cdot \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid W_{[1,2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_{3i}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(f)}{=} (1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid W_{[1,2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}\right) \\
&\overset{(g)}{=} nk_3,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) is due to the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (ii) the inequality in (b) follows since $H\left(X,Y\right) \leq H(X) + H(Y)$; (iii) the inequality in (c) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is a positive quantity; (iv) the equality in (d) is due to the chain rule of the mutual information; (v) the equality in (e) follows since node M does not have any randomness and so X_{3i} is uniquely determined by knowing $(Y_1^n, Y_2^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n)$; (vi) the equality in (f) is due to the Markov chain $X_{3i} -$

$W_1, W_2, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}, Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1} - F^n_{3i}$; (vii) finally, the equality in (g) follows from (2c).

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF THE CONVERSE OF THEOREM 2

For the RY-network, in (2) we set $\mathcal{A} = [1:3]$, $j = 3$, $\kappa \in [1:2]$, $\mathcal{B} = [1:2]$ and $e_3 = e$. We start by proving that the Righ-Hand Side (RHS) of the quantities in (2) is positive. We use (2a), (2b) and (2c) for proving the converse of Theorem 2. The RHS of (2c) is positive as the entropy of a discrete random variable is positive. For the RHS of (2a), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}) \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}\right) \\
&- H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}}\right) \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(Y_{3i}, Z_{3i} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^n, W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}\right) \\
&- H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}}\right) \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} H\left(Y_3^n, Z_3^n \mid F_3^n, W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}\right) - H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}}\right) \\
&= H\left(Y_3^n, Z_3^n \mid W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}}\right) - H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}}\right) \geq 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the equality in (a) follows because given F_{3i}, the pair (Y_{3i}, Z_{3i}) is equal to X_{3i} with probability $(1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}})$ and null otherwise and because of the Markov chain $X_{3i} - W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}, Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1} - F^n_{3i}$; (ii) finally, the equality in (b) is due to the chain rule of entropy.

For the RHS of (2b), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}}\right) \\
&- (1-\delta_3) \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}\right) \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(Y_{3i} | W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}}, Y_3^{i-1}\right) \\
&- (1-\delta_3) \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}\right) \\
&\overset{(b)}{\geq} \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(Y_{3i} | W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}}, Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}\right) \\
&- (1-\delta_3) \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}\right) \\
&= (1-\delta_3) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} | W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}, Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F^n_{3i}\right)\right. \\
&\left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} (1-\delta_3) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} | W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}, Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}\right)\right. \\
&\left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}\right)\right] = 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the equality in (a) follows from the chain rule of the entropy; (ii) the inequality in (b) is due to the conditioning reduces the entropy principle; (iii) finally, the equality in (c) follows because of the Markov chain $X_{3i} - W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}, Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1} - F^n_{3i}$.

First constraints. From (2a) and (2b) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&nk_3 + ne\frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} \\
&= \delta_{3\mathrm{E}}(1-\delta_3) \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}\right) \\
&\overset{(a)}{\geq} \delta_{3\mathrm{E}}(1-\delta_3) \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}\right) \\
&- H\left(Y_3^n \mid W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}}, Z_3^n\right) \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} (1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}) \cdot \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}; X_{3i} \mid Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}\right) \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} (1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}\right)\right. \\
&\left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}, Y_3^{i-1}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(d)}{=} (1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}\right)\right. \\
&- \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{3i}; W_{[1:2]} | Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}\right) \\
&\left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}, Y_3^{i-1}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(e)}{\geq} (1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}\right)\right. \\
&- \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{3i}; W_{[1:2]} | Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}\right) \\
&\left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}, Y_3^{i-1}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(f)}{=} (1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{3i}; W_{[1:2]} \mid Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}\right)\right. \\
&\left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{3i}; W_{[1:2]} | Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F^n_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(g)}{\geq} n(R_1+R_2)\frac{1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}\delta_3} - \epsilon,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is positive; (ii) the equality in (b) is due to (1a) in Lemma 4; (iii) the equality in (c) is due to the definition of mutual information; (iv) the equality in (d) follows from the definition of mutual information; (v) the inequality in (e) follows from the 'conditioning reduces

the entropy' principle; (vi) the equality in (f) is due to the definition of mutual information; (vii) finally, the inequality in (g) follows by means of (1c) and (1d) in Lemma 4.

Second constraints. From (2c) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&nk_\kappa \\
&= \delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\left(1-\delta_\kappa\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} \mid Y_\kappa^{i-1}, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(a)}{\geq} \delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\left(1-\delta_\kappa\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} \mid Y_\kappa^{i-1}, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n\right) \\
&- H\left(Y_\kappa^n \mid W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n, Z_\kappa^n\right) \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} \left(1-\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\right) \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(Y_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}; X_{\kappa i} \mid Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} \left(1-\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\right)\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} \mid Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n\right)\right. \\
&\left.- \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} \mid Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Y_\kappa^{i-1}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(d)}{=} \left(1-\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\right)\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} \mid Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n\right)\right. \\
&- \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{\kappa i}; W_{[1:2]} | Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n\right) \\
&\left.- \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} \mid Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Y_\kappa^{i-1}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(e)}{\geq} \left(1-\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\right)\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} \mid Y_\kappa^{i-1}, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n\right)\right. \\
&- \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{\kappa i}; W_{[1:2]} | Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n\right) \\
&\left.- \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} \mid Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Y_\kappa^{i-1}\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(f)}{=} \left(1-\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\right)\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{\kappa i}; W_{[1:2]} \mid Y_\kappa^{i-1}, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n\right)\right. \\
&\left.- \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{\kappa i}; W_{[1:2]} | Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(g)}{\geq} nR_\kappa \frac{1-\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\delta_\kappa} - \epsilon,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is positive; (ii) the equality in (b) is due to (1a) in Lemma 4; (iii) the equality in (c) is due to the definition of mutual information; (iv) the equality in (d) follows from the definition of mutual information; (v) the inequality in (e) follows from the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (vi) the equality in (f) is due to the definition of mutual information; (vii) finally, the inequality in (g) follows by means by means of (1c) and (1d) in Lemma 4.

Third constraint. From (2a) and (2b) we get $ne + \frac{nk_3}{\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} = H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)$. Now, with this and by using Fano's inequality (keeping in mind that the messages are independent) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&n\left(R_1+R_2\right) + ne + \frac{nk_3}{\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} \\
&\leq I\left(W_{[1:2]}; Y_1^n, Y_2^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} I\left(W_{[1:2]}; Y_3^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} I\left(W_{[1:2]}; Y_3^n \mid F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} H\left(Y_3^n \mid F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} n\left(1-\delta_3\right) + n\epsilon,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows because of the Markov chain $W_{[1:2]} - Y_3^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n - Y_1^n, Y_2^n$; (ii) the equality in (b) follows because of the independence between $F_{\mathcal{A}}^n$ and (W_1, W_2); (iii) the equality in (c) follows from the definition of mutual information; (iv) finally, the inequality in (d) follows since node M receives at most $n\left(1-\delta_3\right)$ packets.

Fourth constraint. From (1f) in Lemma 4 we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
nR_\kappa &\leq \left(1-\delta_\kappa\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(W_\kappa; X_{\kappa i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Y_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}\right) \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} \left(1-\delta_\kappa\right)\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Y_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}\right)\right. \\
&\left.- \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Y_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, W_\kappa\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} \left(1-\delta_\kappa\right) n \\
&- \left(1-\delta_\kappa\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Y_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, W_\kappa\right) \\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} \left(1-\delta_\kappa\right) n \\
&- \left(1-\delta_\kappa\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Y_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, W_{[1:2]}, Z_\kappa^{i-1}\right) \\
&\overset{(d)}{=} \left(1-\delta_\kappa\right) n - \frac{k_\kappa}{\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}} n,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the equality in (a) follows from the definition of mutual information; (ii) the inequality in (b) is due to the fact that $H\left(X_{\kappa i}\right) \leq 1$; (iii) the inequality in (c) is due to the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (iv) finally, the equality in (d) follows from (2c).

Fifth constraint. The node S has a discrete source of randomness U_0 such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&nD_0 = H\left(U_0\right) \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} H\left(U_0 \mid W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(b)}{\geq} I\left(U_0; Y_3^n, Z_3^n, F_3^n \mid W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\overset{(c)}{=}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(U_0; Y_{3i}, Z_{3i}, F_{3i} \mid W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}\right)\\
&\overset{(d)}{=}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(U_0; Y_{3i}, Z_{3i} \mid W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F_{3i}\right)\\
&= (1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}\delta_3)\cdot\\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(U_0; X_{3i} \mid W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}\right)\\
&\overset{(e)}{=} (1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}\delta_3)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} \mid W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}\right)\\
&\overset{(f)}{=} \frac{1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}\delta_3}{\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}\left(1-\delta_3\right)}\left(nk_3 + ne\frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}\right)\\
&= \frac{1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}\delta_3}{\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}\left(1-\delta_3\right)}nk_3 + ne,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the equality in (a) is due to independence of U_0 on the rest of the random variables; (ii) the inequality in (b) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is positive; (iii) the equality in (c) is due to the chain rule of the mutual information; (iv) the equality in (d) follows because of the independence between F_{3i} and U_0; (v) the equality in (e) follows because X_{3i} is uniquely determined given $\left(U_0, W_1, W_2, F_{\mathcal{A}}^{i-1}\right)$; (vi) finally, the equality in (f) follows from (2a) and (2b).

Sixth constraint. From (2a) and (2b) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&n\left(e+\frac{k_3}{\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}\right)\frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}\\
&= \frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}} H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\\
&\overset{(a)}{\geq} \frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}} I\left(Y_3^n; Z_\kappa^n, Y_\kappa^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\\
&\overset{(b)}{=} \frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(Y_3^n; Z_{\kappa i}, Y_{\kappa i} | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, Y_\kappa^{i-1}\right)\\
&= \frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}\left(1-\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\delta_\kappa\right)\cdot\\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(Y_3^n; X_{\kappa i} | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, Y_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, F_{\kappa i}^n\right)\\
&\overset{(c)}{=} \frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}\left(1-\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\delta_\kappa\right)\cdot\\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, Y_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, F_{\kappa i}^n\right)\\
&\overset{(d)}{=} \frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}\left(1-\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\delta_\kappa\right)\cdot\\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, Y_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}\right)\\
&\overset{(e)}{=} nk_\kappa,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is positive; (ii) the equality in (b) is due to the chain rule of the mutual information; (iii) the equality in (c) follows since $X_{\kappa i}$ (with $\kappa \in [1:2]$) is uniquely determined given $(Y_3^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n)$; (iv) the equality in (d) follows because of the Markov chain $X_{\kappa i} - W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Y_\kappa^{i-1}, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1} - F_{\kappa i}^n$; (v) finally, the equality in (e) follows from (2c).

Appendix D
Proof of the converse of Theorem 3

For the X-network, in (2) we set $\mathcal{A} = [1:5]$, $\lambda \in [1:2]$, $j = 3$, $\kappa \in [4:5]$, $\mathcal{B} = \{j\}$, $W_3 = W_4 = W_5 = W_{[1:2]}$ and $e_3 = e$. We start by proving that the Righ-Hand Side (RHS) of the quantities in (2) is positive. It is straightforward to see that the RHS of (2c) and (2d) is positive as the entropy of a discrete random variable is positive. For the RHS of (2a) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(1-\delta_j\delta_{j\mathrm{E}})\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right)\\
&- H\left(Y_j^n | W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\\
&\overset{(a)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(Y_{ji}, Z_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^n, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right)\\
&- H\left(Y_j^n | W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\\
&\overset{(b)}{=} H\left(Y_j^n, Z_j^n \mid F_j^n, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right) - H\left(Y_j^n | W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\\
&= H\left(Y_j^n, Z_j^n \mid W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) - H\left(Y_j^n | W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) \geq 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the equality in (a) follows because given F_{ji}, (Y_{ji}, Z_{ji}) is equal to X_{ji} with probability $(1-\delta_j\delta_{j\mathrm{E}})$ and null otherwise and because of the Markov chain $X_{ji} - W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n, Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1} - F_{ji}^n$; (ii) finally, the equality in (b) is due to the chain rule of entropy.

For the RHS of (2b) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&H\left(Y_j^n | W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\\
&- (1-\delta_j)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n, F_j^{i-1}, W_j\right)\\
&\overset{(a)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(Y_{ji} | W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n, Y_j^{i-1}\right)\\
&- (1-\delta_j)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n, F_j^{i-1}, W_j\right)\\
&\overset{(b)}{\geq} \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(Y_{ji} | W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n, Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}\right)\\
&- (1-\delta_j)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n, F_j^{i-1}, W_j\right)\\
&= (1-\delta_j)\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} | W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n, Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, F_{ji}^n\right)\right.\\
&\qquad\left. - \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n, F_j^{i-1}, W_j\right)\right]\\
&\overset{(c)}{=} (1-\delta_j)\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} | W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n, Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}\right)\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

$$-\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n, F_j^{i-1}, W_j\right)\Bigg] = 0,$$

where: (i) the equality in (a) follows from the chain rule of the entropy; (ii) the inequality in (b) is due to the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (iii) finally, the equality in (c) follows because of the Markov chain $X_{ji} - W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n, Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1} - F_{ji}^n$.

First to third constraints. From (2d), $\forall j \in [1:2]$

$$\begin{aligned} & nk_j \\ &= \delta_{j\mathrm{E}}\left(1-\delta_j\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right) \\ &\geq \delta_{j\mathrm{E}}\left(1-\delta_j\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle. From (2c), $\forall j \in [4:5]$

$$\begin{aligned} & nk_j \\ &= \delta_{j\mathrm{E}}\left(1-\delta_j\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right). \end{aligned}$$

From (2a) and (2b) with $j = 3$

$$\begin{aligned} & nk_j + ne_j\frac{(1-\delta_j)\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_j\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}} \\ &= \delta_{j\mathrm{E}}\left(1-\delta_j\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\forall j \in [1:5]$ with $R_3 = R_1 + R_2$, $R_4 = R_1$, $R_5 = R_2$ and $e_1 = e_2 = e_4 = e_5 = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & nk_j + ne_j\frac{(1-\delta_j)\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_j\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}} \\ &\geq \delta_{j\mathrm{E}}\left(1-\delta_j\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right) \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{a})}{\geq} \delta_{j\mathrm{E}}\left(1-\delta_j\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right) \\ &- H\left(Y_j^n \mid W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n, Z_j^n\right) \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{b})}{=} \left(1-\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(Y_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}; X_{ji} \mid Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right) \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{c})}{=} \left(1-\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}\right)\Bigg[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right) \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n, Y_j^{i-1}\right)\Bigg] \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{d})}{=} \left(1-\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}\right)\Bigg[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right) \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{ji}; W_j | Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right) \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n, Y_j^{i-1}\right)\Bigg] \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{e})}{\geq} \left(1-\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}\right)\Bigg[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right) \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{ji}; W_j | Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right) \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{ji} \mid Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, W_j, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n, Y_j^{i-1}\right)\Bigg] \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{f})}{=} \left(1-\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}\right)\Bigg[\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{ji}; W_j \mid Y_j^{i-1}, Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right) \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(X_{ji}; W_j | Z_j^{i-1}, F_j^{i-1}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}^n\right)\Bigg] \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{g})}{\geq} nR_j\frac{1-\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_{j\mathrm{E}}\delta_j} - \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is positive; (ii) the equality in (b) is due to (1a) in Lemma 4; (iii) the equality in (c) is due to the definition of mutual information; (iv) the equality in (d) follows from the definition of mutual information; (v) the inequality in (e) follows from the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (vi) the equality in (f) is due to the definition of mutual information; (vii) finally, the inequality in (g) follows by means of (1c) and (1d) in Lemma 4.

Fourth constraint. From (2d) and (1b), we have $\frac{nk_\lambda}{\delta_{\lambda\mathrm{E}}} = H\left(Y_\lambda^n | W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)$. By using this and Fano's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} nR_\lambda + \frac{nk_\lambda}{\delta_{\lambda\mathrm{E}}} &\leq I\left(W_\lambda; Y_{\lambda+3}^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_\lambda^n | W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{a})}{\leq} I\left(W_\lambda; Y_3^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_\lambda^n | W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{b})}{\leq} I\left(W_\lambda; Y_\lambda^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_\lambda^n | W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{c})}{=} I\left(W_\lambda; Y_\lambda^n \mid F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_\lambda^n | W_\lambda, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{d})}{=} H\left(Y_\lambda^n \mid F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{e})}{\leq} n\left(1-\delta_\lambda\right) + n\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows because of the Markov chain $W_\lambda - Y_3^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n - Y_{\lambda+3}^n$; (ii) the inequality in (b) follows because of the Markov chain $W_\lambda - Y_\lambda^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n - Y_3^n$; (iii) the equality in (c) follows because of the independence between $F_{\mathcal{A}}^n$ and W_λ; (iv) the equality in (d) follows from the definition of mutual information; (v) finally, the inequality in (e) follows since node M_1 receives at most $n\left(1-\delta_\lambda\right)$ packets on channel $\lambda \in [1:2]$.

Fifth constraint. By means of (1g) in Lemma 4 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & nR_\lambda \\ &\leq \left(1-\delta_{\lambda+3}\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(W_\lambda; X_{\lambda+3i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda+3}^n, Y_{\lambda+3}^{i-1}, F_{\lambda+3}^{i-1}\right) \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{a})}{=} \left(1-\delta_{\lambda+3}\right)\Bigg[\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda+3i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda+3}^n, Y_{\lambda+3}^{i-1}, F_{\lambda+3}^{i-1}\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&- \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda+3i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda+3}^{n}, Y_{\lambda+3}^{i-1}, F_{\lambda+3}^{i-1}, W_{\lambda}\right)\Bigg] \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} (1-\delta_{\lambda+3})\,[n \\
&- \sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\lambda+3i} \mid F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\lambda+3}^{n}, Y_{\lambda+3}^{i-1}, F_{\lambda+3}^{i-1}, W_{\lambda+3}, Z_{\lambda+3}^{i-1}\right)\Bigg] \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} (1-\delta_{\lambda+3})\, n - \frac{n k_{\lambda+3}}{\delta_{\lambda+3\mathrm{E}}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the equality in (a) follows from the definition of mutual information; (ii) the inequality in (b) is because $H\left(X_{\lambda+3i}\right) \leq 1$ and because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (iii) finally, the equality in (c) follows by using (2c).

Sixth constraint. From (2a) and (2b) we have $ne_3 + \frac{nk_3}{\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} = H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)$. By using this and Fano's inequality we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&n\left(R_1+R_2\right) + ne_3 + \frac{nk_3}{\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} \\
&\leq I\left(W_{[1:2]}; Y_4^n, Y_5^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} I\left(W_{[1:2]}; Y_3^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} I\left(W_{[1:2]}; Y_3^n \mid F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} H\left(Y_3^n \mid F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + n\epsilon \\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} n\left(1-\delta_3\right) + n\epsilon,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows because of the Markov chain $W_1, W_2 - Y_3^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n - Y_4^n, Y_5^n$; (ii) the equality in (b) follows because of the independence between $F_{\mathcal{A}}^n$ and (W_1, W_2); (iii) the equality in (c) follows from the definition of mutual information; (iv) finally, the inequality in (d) follows since node M_2 receives at most $n\left(1-\delta_3\right)$ packets.

Seventh constraint. From (2d) and (1b) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&n\left(\frac{k_1}{\delta_{1\mathrm{E}}} + \frac{k_2}{\delta_{2\mathrm{E}}}\right)\frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} \\
&= \frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}\left[H\left(Y_1^n | W_1, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) + H\left(Y_2^n | W_2, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(a)}{\geq} \frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}\left[H\left(Y_1^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\right. \\
&\left.+H\left(Y_2^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right)\right] \\
&\overset{(b)}{\geq} \frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} H\left(Y_1^n, Y_2^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(c)}{\geq} \frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}} I\left(Y_1^n, Y_2^n; Z_3^n, Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(d)}{=} \frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}\cdot \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(Y_1^n, Y_2^n; Z_{3i}, Y_{3i} | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n, Z_3^{i-1}, Y_3^{i-1}\right) \\
&= \frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}\left(1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}\delta_3\right)\cdot \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(Y_1^n, Y_2^n; X_{3i} | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Z_3^{i-1}, Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}, F_{3i}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(e)}{=} \frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}\left(1-\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}\delta_3\right)\cdot \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{3i} | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Z_3^{i-1}, Y_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1}\right) \\
&\overset{(f)}{=} nk_3 + ne_3\frac{(1-\delta_3)\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_3\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) is due to the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (ii) the inequality in (b) is because $H\left(A,B\right) \leq H\left(A\right) + H\left(B\right)$; (iii) the inequality in (c) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is positive; (iv) the equality in (d) is due to the chain rule of the mutual information; (v) the equality in (e) follows since X_{3i} is uniquely determined given $(Y_1^n, Y_2^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n)$ and because of the Markov chain $X_{3i} - W_1, W_2, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus 3}^n, Y_3^{i-1}, Z_3^{i-1}, F_3^{i-1} - F_{3i}^n$; (vi) finally, the equality in (f) follows from (2a) and (2b).

Eighth constraint. From (2a) and (2b) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&n\left(e_3 + \frac{k_3}{\delta_{3\mathrm{E}}}\right)\frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}} \\
&= \frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}} H\left(Y_3^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(a)}{\geq} \frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}} I\left(Y_3^n; Z_\kappa^n, Y_\kappa^n | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} \frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(Y_3^n; Z_{\kappa i}, Y_{\kappa i} | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, Y_\kappa^{i-1}\right) \\
&= \frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}\left(1-\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\delta_\kappa\right)\cdot \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(Y_3^n; X_{\kappa i} | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, Y_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, F_{\kappa i}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} \frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}\left(1-\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\delta_\kappa\right)\cdot \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, Y_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}, F_{\kappa i}^n\right) \\
&\overset{(d)}{=} \frac{(1-\delta_\kappa)\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}{1-\delta_\kappa\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}}\left(1-\delta_{\kappa\mathrm{E}}\delta_\kappa\right)\cdot \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} H\left(X_{\kappa i} | W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, Y_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1}\right) \\
&\overset{(e)}{=} nk_\kappa,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is positive; (ii) the equality in (b) is due to the chain rule of the mutual information; (iii) the equality in (c) follows since $X_{\kappa i}$ (with $\kappa \in [4:5]$) is uniquely determined given $(Y_3^n, F_{\mathcal{A}}^n)$; (iv) the equality in (d) follows because of the Markov chain $X_{\kappa i} - W_{[1:2]}, F_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\kappa}^n, Y_\kappa^{i-1}, Z_\kappa^{i-1}, F_\kappa^{i-1} - F_{\kappa i}^n$; (v) finally, the equality in (e) follows from (2c).

REFERENCES

[1] U. M. Maurer, "Secret key agreement by public discussion from common information," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory,*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 733–742, 1993.

[2] C. Shannon, "Communication theory of secrecy systems," *The Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 28, pp. 656–715, 1949.

[3] A. D. Wyner, "The wire-tap channel," *The Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 1355–1387, 1975.

[4] N. Cai and R. W. Yeung, "Secure network coding on a wiretap network," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 424–435, 2011.

[5] L. Czap, V. Prabhakaran, C. Fragouli, and S. Diggavi, "Secret message capacity of erasure broadcast channels with feedback," in *IEEE Inf. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2011, pp. 65–69.

[6] L. Czap, V. Prabhakaran, S. Diggavi, and C. Fragouli, "Exploiting common randomness: A resource for network secrecy," in *IEEE Inf. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2013, pp. 1–5.

[7] A. Papadopoulos, L. Czap, and C. Fragouli, "Secret message capacity of a line network," in *52nd Annual Allerton Conf. on Commun., Control, and Comput.*, 2014, pp. 1341–1348.

[8] ——, "LP formulations for secrecy over erasure networks with feedback," in *IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2015, pp. 954–958.